The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Con. Res. 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 22

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, August 1, 2013, through Sunday, August 11, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, August 12, 2013, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on Monday, August 12, 2013, it stand adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, September 9, 2013, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Friday, August 2, 2013, through Friday, September 6, 2013, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, September 9, 2013, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

first.

PROMOTING ENERGY SAVINGS IN RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS AND INDUSTRY—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE FOR COOPERATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for this session, this work period, we have done a

lot of work, and it has turned out quite well. None of us got what we wanted, but we all got something. I appreciate the cooperation of Democrats and Republicans this afternoon. It is always during the last few hours before a recess that problems come up, and this is an adjournment, so it is even more difficult. So I am grateful to everyone for their participation and their cooperation.

As for Senator Grassley, he has left the floor, but I wish to express my appreciation to him. He had an issue that took us a while to work through, and it all worked out for the better for not only he and Senator Leahy but, most importantly, for our staff.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with Senator STABENOW.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, as the two Chambers prepare to go to conference on the farm bill, I rise to request a commitment from the distinguished chairwoman of the Senate Agriculture Committee to protect the Senate farm bill's vital provision to end direct payments outright.

While I commend the chairwoman for her leadership in facilitating the full and immediate elimination of direct payments in the Senate-passed farm bill, many of my colleagues may be surprised to learn that section 1101 of the House-passed farm bill contains a carve-out that would actually continue direct payments to cotton farmers at a rate of 70 percent in 2014 and a rate of 60 percent in 2015.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, this House-passed extension of direct payments would cost tax-payers an estimated \$823 million.

Already a poster child for Federal largesse, direct payments have more recently become synonymous with waste, fraud, and abuse. As the Washington Post put it, recent analyses of the program have found that it subsidizes people who aren't really farming: the idle, the urban, and, occasionally, the dead.

Investigations have uncovered taxpayer-backed direct payments being paid to billionaires, to New York City condo dwellers, and to nonfarming homeowners who happen to live on former farmlands.

Direct payments have also been the target of a series of scathing reports published by the GAO, the most recent of which went so far as to question the purpose and need for direct payments, stating that they did not "align with principles significant to integrity, effectiveness, and efficiency in farm bill programs." The report went on to recommend that Congress consider eliminating direct payments outright.

I ask the distinguished chairwoman, was the unsustainable cost and the pattern of waste, fraud, and abuse associated with direct payments the impetus for the chairwoman to ensure that this

subsidy was fully and immediately eliminated in the most recent Senatepassed farm bill?

Ms. STABENOW. I thank my colleague from Arizona for his passion on this issue.

Yes, it has been my goal from the beginning of this farm bill process to end unnecessary subsidies and to clean up areas of waste, fraud, and abuse starting with the direct payment program. The program is indefensible in this current budget climate. It makes absolutely no sense to pay farmers when they don't suffer a loss and to pay people who aren't even farming.

That is also why we included the strongest reforms to the commodity programs in the history of the farm bill, eliminating payments to people who are not farming and tightening the AGI requirements and the amount any single farmer can receive.

We even have reformed the crop insurance program. The No. 1 thing we have heard from listening to farmers all across this country is that they need market-based risk management tools.

Farming is an extremely risky business. Farmers plant seeds in the spring and hope that by the time the harvest rolls around there will have been enough rain and the right temperatures to give them a good crop. That is why we strengthened crop insurance and made that available to farmers growing different kinds of crops—because we want farmers to have skin in the game. As I have always said, that is about farmers paying a bill for crop insurance, not getting a check from the direct payment program.

Mr. FLAKE. To the chairwoman's credit, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry has maintained a sustained effort to eliminate direct payments. In fact, between the 2012 and 2013 Senate farm bills and the majority's sequester replacement legislation, 76 current Members of the Senate—76 current Members of the Senate—have voted for the full and immediate elimination of direct payments.

Does the chairwoman agree that even the limited \$823 million extension of direct payments found in the Housepassed bill would be at odds with the recorded votes of a supermajority of the Senate?

Ms. STABENOW. My friend from Arizona is correct. The Senate has repeatedly voted to end direct payments.

Mr. FLAKE. To that end, I respectfully request that the distinguished chairwoman make a commitment that she will protect the Senate's vital provision and work to ensure that any conference report brought before the Senate achieves a full and immediate elimination of direct payments.

Ms. STABENOW. Yes, that is my intension. I strongly agree we should not be spending taxpayer dollars to fund these direct payment subsidies, and I will do everything I can to make sure the conference committee adopts the Senate version on this issue.